

Elliptic equations with critical exponent on a torus invariant region of $\mathbb{S}^3$

Carolina A. Rey

Abstract

We study the multiplicity of positive solutions of the critical elliptic equation:

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^3} U = -(U^5 + \lambda U) \quad \text{on } \Omega$$

that vanish on the boundary of Ω , where Ω is a region of $\mathbb{S}^3$ which is invariant by the natural $\mathbb{T}^2$ -action. H. Brezis and L. A. Peletier in [5] consider the case in which Ω is invariant by the $SO(3)$ -action, namely, when Ω is a spherical cap. We show that the number of solutions increases as $\lambda \rightarrow -\infty$, giving an answer of a particular case of an open problem proposed by H. Brezis and L. A. Peletier in [5].

1 Introduction

We consider the critical elliptic equation:

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^3} U = -(U^5 + \lambda U) \quad \text{on } \Omega \tag{1}$$

where $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^3}$ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator on $\mathbb{S}^3$ and Ω is a particular open subset of $\mathbb{S}^3$. We look for positive solutions of (1) such that

$$U = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \tag{2}$$

Problems of this kind have attracted the attention of several researchers with the aim to understand the structure and properties of the solutions.

This study was motivated by the Brezis-Nirenberg problem in $\mathbb{R}^3$:

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^3} U = -(U^5 + \lambda U), U > 0 \text{ in } B_{R^*}, \quad U = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B_{R^*} \tag{3}$$

where B_{R^*} is the ball of radius R^* of $\mathbb{R}^3$. Using variational techniques, H. Brezis and L. Nirenberg obtained in [4] necessary and sufficient conditions on the value of λ for the existence of a solution. This solution was shown to be unique in [7].

Similar problems were considered in [2], [3] and [5]. Let B' be a geodesic ball centered at the North pole in $\mathbb{S}^3$, where θ^* $\in (0, \pi)$ is the radius of B' , i.e., the geodesic distance of the North pole to $\partial B'$. Problem (1)-(2) with $\Omega = B'$ has been investigated by C. Bandle and R. Benguria in [2], C. Bandle and L.A. Peletier in [3] and H. Brezis and L. A. Peletier in [5] in order to identify the

range of values of the parameters θ^* and λ for which there exists a solution. In particular, Brezis and L. A. Peletier studied the number of radial solutions when $\lambda \rightarrow -\infty$. The main result in [5] reads:

Theorem (H. Brezis and L. A. Peletier). Given any $\theta^* \in (\pi/2, \pi)$ and any $k \geq 1$, there exists a constant $A_k > 0$ such that for $\lambda < -A_k$, problem (1)-(2) with $\Omega = B'$ has at least $2k$ positive solutions such that $U(\text{North pole}) \in (0, |\lambda|^{1/4})$.

Inspired by this result, we study problem (1)-(2) for the special case where Ω is a torus invariant region of $\mathbb{S}^3$. With this aim, consider $\mathbb{T}^2 = \mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ and the natural action $\mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^3$ given by

$$(X, Y)(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}, \tilde{w}) = (X \cdot (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}), Y \cdot (\tilde{z}, \tilde{w})) \quad (4)$$

where $\cdot$ is the complex multiplication. This action is an isometry of $\mathbb{S}^3$ and there are two special orbits: $\mathbb{S}^1 \times \{0\}$ and $\{0\} \times \mathbb{S}^1$. The distance between these two singular orbits is $\pi/2$. As in the case of spherical caps studied by Brezis and Peletier, we consider an open set Ω in $\mathbb{S}^3$ invariant on the $\mathbb{T}^2$ -orbits:

$$\Omega = \{x \in \mathbb{S}^3 / \text{dist}(x, \mathbb{S}^1 \times 0) \leq \theta_1\},$$

with $\theta_1 \in (0, \pi/2)$.

Now we present a change of variables leading to a different formulation of problem (1)-(2). With this aim, we introduce the next local coordinates in $\mathbb{R}^4$:

$$\begin{cases} x_1 &= r \cos(\theta) \cos(\eta_1) \\ x_2 &= r \cos(\theta) \sin(\eta_1) \\ x_3 &= r \sin(\theta) \cos(\eta_2) \\ x_4 &= r \sin(\theta) \sin(\eta_2) \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where $r = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 + x_4^2}$, $0 \leq \theta < \pi/2$, $0 \leq \eta_1, \eta_2 \leq 2\pi$. In these coordinates, the unit sphere $\mathbb{S}^3$ can be parameterized by $r = 1$, $\{0 \leq \theta \leq \pi/2, 0 < \eta_1, \eta_2 < 2\pi\}$. The round metric g on the 3-sphere in these coordinates is given by

$$ds^2 = d\theta^2 + \cos^2(\theta)d\eta_1^2 + \sin^2(\theta)d\eta_2^2$$

Note that θ is the geodesic distance to the orbit $\mathbb{S}^1 \times \{0\}$. Recall that the Beltrami-Laplace operator on $\mathbb{S}^3$ in local coordinates is given by:

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^3} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_i} \left(g_{ii}^{-1} \sqrt{|g|} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_i} \right).$$

Let $\Omega = \Omega_{\theta_1} = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in \mathbb{S}^3 / 0 \leq \theta \leq \theta_1\}$ with $\theta_1 \in (0, \pi/2)$. Consequently Ω is an open subset in $\mathbb{S}^3$ invariant by the $\mathbb{T}^2$ -action.

Suppose that the function $U : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is invariant by the $\mathbb{T}^2$ -action. Then $U(x, y, z, w) = u(\theta)$ for some function $u : [0, \theta_1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and since $|g| = \cos^2(\theta) \sin^2(\theta)$,

the Laplace-Beltrami operator on $\mathbb{S}^3$ applied to U takes the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^3} U &= \frac{1}{\cos(\theta) \sin(\theta)} \frac{d}{d\theta} \left(\cos(\theta) \sin(\theta) \frac{du}{d\theta} \right) \\
&= u''(\theta) + \left(\frac{\cos(\theta)}{\sin(\theta)} - \frac{\sin(\theta)}{\cos(\theta)} \right) u'(\theta) \\
&= u''(\theta) + 2 \frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} u'(\theta)
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

It follows that the original problem is equivalent to finding solutions of:

$$\begin{cases} u''(\theta) + 2 \frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} u'(\theta) &= \lambda (u(\theta)^5 - u(\theta)), & u > 0 & \text{ on } (0, \theta_1) \\ u'(0) &= 0 \\ u(\theta_1) &= 0 \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

Also we consider the analogue of equation (1) in the whole sphere:

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^3} U = \lambda (U^5 - U), \quad U > 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^3 \tag{8}$$

Positive solutions of (8) are called “ground state” solutions. We have the following result:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $n \geq 1$ and $|\lambda| \in [(2n+1)(2n+2), (2n+2)(2n+3))$. Then for every $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ there exists at least one solution U_k of problem (8), where $U_k = u_k(\theta)$ has the following properties:*

- (i) u_k has exactly k local maximum on $(0, \frac{\pi}{2})$
- (ii) $u_k(\pi/2 - \theta) = u_k(\theta)$ for $\theta \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$;
- (iii) $u_k(0) < 1$.

We are interested in positive solutions of (7) with initial value in the interval $(0, 1)$. Firstly we prove a theorem of nonexistence:

Theorem 1.2. *If $\theta_1 \in (0, \pi/4)$, then there are no solutions of (7) with initial value in the interval $(0, 1)$.*

This means that the solutions of (7) with initial value in the interval $(0, 1)$ do not vanish before $\pi/4$. However, we shall prove the existence of an increasing number of solutions of problem (7) as λ goes to $-\infty$ with initial value in the interval $(0, 1)$, which gives a partial positive answer to the open problem 8.3 proposed by H. Brezis and L. A. Peletier in [5]. Our main result in this paper is the following

Theorem 1.3. *Given any $k \geq 1$ and any $\theta_1 > \pi/4$, then there exists a constant $A_k > 0$ such that for $\lambda < -A_k$ problem (7) has at least $2k$ solutions with initial value in the interval $(0, 1)$.*

Our approach mainly relies upon a method that has been successfully used in [5]. First we use this method to show that there exists at least 2 solutions of problem (7) with initial value in the interval $(0, 1)$ that have a single spike or maximum. The next step is to prove the theorem in the case $k = 2$ using the same techniques. Finally the theorem follows by induction.




Figure 1: 2-spike solution u of problem (7) for $\lambda = -25$ and $u(0) = 0.3$




Figure 2: 4-spike solution u of problem (7) for $\lambda = -100$ and $u(0) = 0.3$

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we will study properties of the ground state solutions and prove Theorem 1.1. Section 3 contains some results about auxiliary linear problems, that will help us to prove the main theorem in next section. Theorem 1.2 will be proved in section 4, as well as Theorem 1.3.

2 Positive solutions on $\mathbb{S}^3$

In this section we present a detailed study of the problem obtained by linearizing equation (1) around the nontrivial constant solution when $\lambda < 0$. Then we use these results to prove Theorem 1.1. Suppose that $\theta_1 \in (\pi/4, \pi/2]$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and denote $u(\theta) = u_\alpha(\theta)$ the solution of:

$$\begin{cases} u''(\theta) + 2 \frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} u'(\theta) &= \lambda (u(\theta)^5 - u(\theta)) & \text{on } (0, \theta_1) \\ u(0) &= \alpha \\ u'(0) &= 0 \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Since $u_1(\theta, \lambda) \equiv 1$, it is important to understand the behavior of the solutions $u_\alpha(\theta)$ with α close to 1. With this aim, consider the function

$$w_\lambda(\theta) = \frac{d}{d\alpha} \Big|_{\alpha=1} u_\alpha(\theta, \lambda).$$

Then w_λ is the solution of the linear problem

$$\begin{cases} w''(\theta) + 2 \frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} w'(\theta) &= -4|\lambda|w, & \text{on } (0, \theta_1) \\ w(0) &= 1, \\ w'(0) &= 0. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Let w_n the solution of (10) with $|\lambda| = \lambda_n := n(n+1)$ and $\theta_1 = \pi/2$. The following lemmas can be proved with the same techniques used in [8].

Lemma 2.1. *The solution w_n of (10) is a linear combination of $\cos^{n-2j}(2\theta)$, where $0 \leq 2j \leq n$.*

Lemma 2.2. *The solution w_n has exactly n zeros in the interval $(0, \frac{\pi}{2})$.*

Lemma 2.3. *If $|\lambda| \in [\lambda_{2n+1}, \lambda_{2n+2})$ then the solution of (10) with $\theta_1 = \pi/2$ has exactly n zeros in the interval $(0, \pi/4)$.*

Denote

$$\tau_1^0(\lambda) < \tau_2^0(\lambda) < \dots < \tau_n^0(\lambda)$$

the critical points of w_λ . From these results we conclude that for $\alpha < 1$ sufficiently close to 1 and $|\lambda| \in [\lambda_{2n+1}, \lambda_{2n+2})$ the solution u_α has n critical points denoted

$$\tau_1(\alpha) < \tau_2(\alpha) < \dots < \tau_n(\alpha).$$

Remark. (i) $\tau_k = \tau_k(\alpha)$ is a continuous function.

(ii) It is clear from (9) that

$$u_\alpha(\tau_j) > 1 \text{ if } j \text{ is odd, and } u_\alpha(\tau_j) < 1 \text{ if } j \text{ is even.}$$

Using the uniform continuity of the solution of problem (9) with respect to the initial value α we obtain:

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that w_λ has a critical point $\tau_k^0(\lambda)$ for some $k \geq 1$. Then for $\alpha < 1$ sufficiently close to 1, the solution u_α has a critical point $\tau_k(\alpha)$ and*

$$\tau_k(\alpha) \rightarrow \tau_k^0(\lambda), \text{ as } \alpha \rightarrow 1.$$

The techniques used to prove the following lemmas are the same employed by J. Petean in [8].

Lemma 2.5. *If for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ the solution u_α of problem (9) satisfies $u'_\alpha(\pi/4) = 0$, then $u'_\alpha(\frac{\pi}{2}) = 0$ and $u_\alpha(\theta) = u_\alpha(\frac{\pi}{2} - \theta)$ for $\theta \in (0, \frac{\pi}{4})$.*

Proof. The function $v(\theta) = u_\alpha(\pi/2 - \theta)$ for $\theta \in [\pi/4, \pi/2)$ is also a solution of the equation. Moreover $v(\pi/4) = u_\alpha(\pi/4)$ and $v(\pi/2) = 0 = u'_\alpha(\pi/4)$. Therefore $v = u_\alpha$ and the lemma follows. $\square$

Lemma 2.6. *If α is close to zero, then the solution u_α of problem (9) has no local extremes on $(0, \pi/4)$.*

Now define:

$$F(u) := \int_0^u (s^5 - s) ds = \frac{1}{6}u^6 - \frac{1}{2}u^2. \quad (11)$$

Then $F(\alpha) < 0$. Note that F has only one positive zero $\sigma := 3^{\frac{1}{4}}$.

Lemma 2.7. *If $\tau_j(\alpha) < \frac{\pi}{4}$, then $0 < u_\alpha(\tau_j(\alpha)) < \sigma$.*

To prove this lemma we consider the energy function defined by

$$E_\alpha(\theta) := \frac{(u'_\alpha(\theta))^2}{2} - \lambda \left(\frac{(u_\alpha(\theta))^6}{6} - \frac{(u_\alpha(\theta))^2}{2} \right). \quad (12)$$

If u_α is a solution of problem (9) then we have

$$E'_\alpha(\theta) = -2 \frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} (u'_\alpha(\theta))^2.$$

Consequently E_α is decreasing on $[0, \frac{\pi}{4}]$ and $E_\alpha(0) = -\lambda F(\alpha)$.

Proof of Lemma 2.7. Since E_α is decreasing on $[0, \frac{\pi}{4}]$ and $0 < \tau_j(\alpha) \leq \frac{\pi}{4}$, it follows that

$$E_\alpha(\tau_j) < E_\alpha(0) = -\lambda F(\alpha).$$

Consequently, since $E_\alpha(\tau_j(\alpha)) = -\lambda F(u_\alpha(\tau_j(\alpha)))$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ we have that

$$F(u_\alpha(\tau_j(\alpha))) < F(\alpha) < 0.$$

This means that $0 < u_\alpha(\tau_j(\alpha)) < \sigma$, as asserted. $\square$

Next we define α_k^* as the infimum value of α for which $\tau_k(\alpha)$ exists on $(\alpha, 1)$:

$\alpha_k^* = \inf\{\alpha_0 \in (0, 1) : \text{for all } \alpha \in (\alpha_0, 1) \text{ } u_\alpha \text{ has at least } k \text{ critical points on } (0, \pi/2)\}.$

Lemma 2.8. *Suppose that $\tau_k(\alpha)$ exists for some α close to 1 so that α_k^* is well defined. Then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$\tau_k(\alpha) \geq \frac{\pi}{4} \quad \text{if } \alpha \in (\alpha_k^*, \alpha_k^* + \delta)$$

Proof. If $\alpha_k^* = 0$ then the assertion follows from the continuous dependence on initial data. Thus we may assume that $\alpha_k^* \in (0, 1)$. Suppose there exists a decreasing sequence $\{\alpha_j\}$ such that

$$\tau_k(\alpha_j) < \frac{\pi}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_j \rightarrow \alpha_k^*.$$

Since the sequences $\{\tau_k(\alpha_j)\}$ and $\{u_{\alpha_j}(\tau_k(\alpha_j))\}$ are bounded by Lemma 2.7, it follows that there exists $\tau_k^* \in [0, \frac{\pi}{4}]$ and an $u^* \in [0, \sigma]$ such that, taking a subsequence, we may suppose:

$$\tau_k(\alpha_j) \rightarrow \tau_k^* \quad \text{and} \quad u_{\alpha_j}(\tau_k(\alpha_j)) \rightarrow u^*.$$

If u^* is 1 or 0, then by uniqueness $u_{\alpha_k^*}$ is constant, which contradicts the fact that $\alpha_k^* \in (0, 1)$. If $u^* \in (0, 1)$, then we use the Implicit Function Theorem with the function $G(\alpha, \theta) = u'_\alpha(\theta)$. Since $\alpha_k^* \neq 0, 1$, it follows that $\frac{d}{d\theta}G(\alpha_k^*, \theta) \neq 0$. But since $G(\alpha_k^*, \theta) = 0$, we have that $\tau_k(\alpha)$ is well defined for all α in a neighbourhood of α_k^* , which contradicts the definition of α_k^* . $\square$

We end this section with the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Suppose that $n \geq 1$ and $|\lambda| \in [(2n+1)(2n+2), (2n+2)(2n+3))$. Given $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ let $\tau_k(\alpha)$ be the k -th local extreme of u_α . We shall show that

$$\tau_k(\alpha_0) = \frac{\pi}{4}$$

for some α_0 and hence the solution u_{α_0} has k local extremes on $(0, \frac{\pi}{4}]$. Since $u'_{\alpha_0}(\tau_k) = 0$, by Lemma 2.5 it follows that u_{α_0} satisfies (i) – (iii) of Theorem 1.1.

By Lemma 2.4, since $|\lambda| \in [\lambda_{2n+1}, \lambda_{2n+2})$ and α is close to 1, the solution u_α has n local extremes $(0, \pi/4)$. Therefore $\tau_k(\alpha) < \frac{\pi}{4}$. On the other hand, by Lemma 2.8 we know that if α is close to α_k^* then $\tau_k(\alpha) \geq \frac{\pi}{4}$. By continuous dependence it follows that there is α_0 such that $\tau_k(\alpha_0) = \frac{\pi}{4}$. $\square$

3 Auxiliary results

Now we consider three auxiliary linear problems and establish some results that help us to prove our main Theorem in next section.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\kappa > 0$ and K be constants. Then there are constants $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and $\beta > 0$ such that the solution φ_ϵ of*

$$\begin{cases} \epsilon^2 \varphi'' - 2\epsilon^2 K \varphi' - \kappa \varphi &= 0 \\ \varphi(\pm\delta) &= 1/2 \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

satisfies: $\varphi_\epsilon(0) < e^{-\beta/\epsilon}$ for all $\epsilon < \epsilon_1$.

Proof. Note that $\varphi_\epsilon(\theta) = Ae^{c_1\theta} + Be^{c_2\theta}$, with A, B given by

$$A = \frac{1 - e^{2c_2\delta}}{2(e^{c_1\delta} - e^{(2c_2 - c_1)\delta})}, \quad \text{and} \quad B = \frac{1 - e^{2c_1\delta}}{2(e^{c_2\delta} - e^{(2c_1 - c_2)\delta})};$$

where c_1, c_2 are the roots of the equation $\epsilon^2 x^2 - 2\epsilon^2 Kx - \kappa = 0$. Then

$$c_1, c_2(\epsilon) = K \pm \sqrt{\mu_\epsilon}$$

where $\mu_\epsilon = K^2 + \kappa/\epsilon^2$. Now it is easy to see that $c_1(\epsilon) \rightarrow +\infty$, $c_2(\epsilon) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ and consequently

$$e^{\sqrt{\mu_\epsilon}\delta}(A + B) \rightarrow C, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0$$

where C is some positive constant. It follows that there are constants $\beta > 0$ and $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that

$$\varphi_\epsilon(0) = A + B < e^{-\beta/\epsilon}, \quad \text{if } \epsilon < \epsilon_1.$$

□

Now we shall study the behavior of the solutions of the equation

$$Z''(s) + Z(s)^5 - Z(s) = 0, \quad \text{for } s < 0 \quad (14)$$

when $s \rightarrow -\infty$. To this end consider the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *There exists a unique positive solution $Z(s)$ to the equation (14) on the interval $(-\infty, 0)$ such that*

$$Z'(0) = 0 \quad (15)$$

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} Z(s) = 0. \quad (16)$$

Proof. It is known that there is at least one positive solution of problem (14)-(16). Let Z be a solution of problem (14)-(15) and consider

$$h(\theta) = \frac{Z'(\theta)^2}{2} + \frac{Z(\theta)^6}{6} - \frac{Z(\theta)^2}{2}$$

Then

$$h'(\theta) = Z'(\theta) (Z''(\theta) + Z(\theta)^5 - Z(\theta)) = 0$$

and we have $h(\theta) = c$, with c a constant given by

$$c = \frac{Z(0)^6}{6} - \frac{Z(0)^2}{2}.$$

Note that if $Z(0) < 3^{1/4}$, then the constant c is negative and consequently Z oscillates around 1. On the other hand if $Z(0) > 3^{1/4}$, then the constant c is positive and it follows that Z vanishes at a negative point.

Finally if Z satisfies the condition (16), then we take the limit when $s \rightarrow -\infty$ in the previous equation and obtain $c = 0$. Since we look for positive solutions, it follows that

$$Z(0) = 3^{1/4}. \quad (17)$$

By the uniqueness theorem of solutions for ordinary differential equations we know that there is a unique solution of (14) with initial conditions (15) and (17) and it satisfies $Z > 0$ on $(-\infty, 0)$.

□

Lemma 3.3. *Let $z = z_\epsilon$ be a solution of the equation*

$$z''(s) + 2\epsilon \frac{\cos(2T_0 + 2s\epsilon)}{\sin(2T_0 + 2s\epsilon)} z'(s) + z(s)^5 - z(s) = 0 \quad (18)$$

which is positive on the interval $(\psi(\epsilon), 0)$ with the initial conditions

$$z'(0) = 0 \quad (19)$$

$$z(0) = u_0(\epsilon) \quad (20)$$

and let Z be the unique solution of problem (14)-(16). Assume that $0 < u_0(\epsilon) < M$ for all $\epsilon > 0$, where M is a positive constant, and that $\psi(\theta)$ is a function such that $\psi(\epsilon) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Then

$$z_\epsilon(s) \rightarrow Z(s) \quad \text{and} \quad z'_\epsilon(s) \rightarrow Z'(s) \quad \text{when } \epsilon \rightarrow 0$$

uniformly over bounded intervals and, in particular,

$$u_0(\epsilon) \rightarrow 3^{1/4} \quad \text{when } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. Since the family of solutions $\{z_\epsilon(s) : 0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0\}$ is equicontinuous it follows from Arzelà-Ascoli Theorem that

$$z_\epsilon(s) \rightarrow Z(s)$$

along a sequence, uniformly on bounded intervals. Since Z is unique the entire family converges to Z as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Now if $u_0(\epsilon)$ does not converge to $3^{1/4}$ when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, then there is a constant $k \neq 3^{1/4}$ and a subsequence $\{\epsilon_j\}$ such that $\epsilon_j \rightarrow 0$ when $j \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$u_0(\epsilon_j) \rightarrow k \quad \text{when } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

But we have just proved that $z_\epsilon(0) \rightarrow Z(0)$. Then $Z(0)$ must to be equal to k . It was observed in the proof of Lemma 3.3 that if $k \neq 3^{1/4}$ then either Z oscillates, or Z vanishes when s tends to $-\infty$. This cannot happen.

□

4 Proof of main Theorems

This section is devoted to the proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is based on the techniques used by C. Bandle and R. Benguria in [2] to prove a nonexistence result.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Multiply equation (7) by $u'(\theta)$ and integrate over $(0, \theta_1)$. This yields

$$\frac{1}{2}u'(\theta_1)^2 + 2 \int_0^{\theta_1} \frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} (u'(\theta))^2 d\theta = -\lambda F(\alpha). \quad (21)$$

If $0 < \theta < \theta_1 < \frac{\pi}{4}$ then $\frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} > 0$. Since $\lambda < 0$, we have a contradiction:

$$0 < \frac{1}{2}u'(\theta_1)^2 + 2 \int_0^{\theta_1} \frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} (u')^2 d\theta = -\lambda F(\alpha) < 0.$$

□

Now we prove Theorem 1.3 for $k = 1$. We shall show that there exist at least two solutions of problem (7) with initial value in the interval $(0, 1)$ that have a single spike. Let

$$\epsilon^2 = \frac{1}{|\lambda|}$$

and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then consider the initial value problem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \epsilon^2 u''(\theta) + 2\epsilon^2 \frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} u'(\theta) + u(\theta)^5 - u(\theta) &= 0 \quad \text{in } (0, \theta_1) \\ u &> 0 \quad \text{in } (0, \theta_1) \\ u(0) &= \alpha \\ u'(0) &= 0. \end{array} \right. \quad (22)$$

We denote the solution by $u_{\alpha, \epsilon}(t)$ and define

$$\Theta(\alpha, \epsilon) = \sup\{\theta \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2}) : u_{\alpha, \epsilon} > 0 \quad \text{in } (0, \theta)\}. \quad (23)$$

The proof of Theorem 1.3 is based on a shooting method: We shall show that for ϵ small enough there are two values $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (0, 1)$ such that $\Theta(\alpha_i, \epsilon) = \theta_1$ for $i = 1, 2$ and the solutions $u_{\alpha_1, \epsilon}$ and $u_{\alpha_2, \epsilon}$ have exactly one spike on the interval $(0, \theta_1)$. These techniques have been used successfully in [5].

Note that Theorem 1.2 implies that $\Theta(\alpha, \epsilon) > \frac{\pi}{4}$. It may happen that the solution does not vanish in the interval $(0, \frac{\pi}{2})$. Therefore we define $\mathcal{A}(\epsilon)$ as the set of values of α for which $u_{\alpha, \epsilon}$ vanishes before $\frac{\pi}{2}$:

$$\mathcal{A}(\epsilon) = \{\alpha \in (0, 1) : 0 < \Theta(\alpha, \epsilon) < \frac{\pi}{2}\}.$$

$\mathcal{A}$ is an open set that depends on ϵ and has several connected components. Moreover if $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ then it follows by uniqueness that

$$u_{\alpha, \epsilon}(\Theta(\alpha, \epsilon)) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad u'_{\alpha, \epsilon}(\Theta(\alpha, \epsilon)) < 0.$$

On the other hand if we fix a $T_0 \in (\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{2})$, then by the Sturm Comparison Theorem for ϵ small enough the solution w_λ of the linear equation (10) has a maximum in $\tau_1^0(\lambda) < T_0$. Hence there exists an initial value $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\tau_1(\alpha_0) = T_0.$$

Since α_0 depends on ϵ denote

$$\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(\epsilon); \quad u_\epsilon(\theta) = u_{\alpha_0(\epsilon), \epsilon}(\theta) \quad \text{and} \quad u_0(\epsilon) = u_\epsilon(T_0).$$

In other words, fixed $T_0 \in (\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{2})$ and ϵ small enough, we can find a solution u_ϵ of problem (22) that reaches a maximum $u_0(\epsilon)$ at $\theta = T_0$. We shall show that for ϵ small enough there are at least two different values of $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\Theta(\alpha(\epsilon), \epsilon) = \theta_1$.

It is clear that $u_0(\epsilon) > 1$. In the following lemmas we show that for ϵ small enough, $F(u_0(\epsilon)) > 0$. Then, since F is increasing on $(1, \infty)$ and $u_0(\epsilon) > 1$, it follows that $u_0(\epsilon) > \sigma$, where $\sigma = 3^{1/4}$ is the positive zero of F .

Lemma 4.1. *There exist constants $A > 0$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that*

$$F(u_0(\epsilon)) > A\epsilon \quad \text{for } \epsilon < \epsilon_0.$$

Consider the energy function $E_{\alpha_0}(\theta)$ associated with the solution u_{α_0} defined in (12) with $\epsilon^2 = \frac{1}{|\lambda|}$. It satisfies

$$E_{\alpha_0}(0) = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} F(\alpha_0) \quad \text{and} \quad E_{\alpha_0}(T_0) = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} F(u_0(\epsilon)).$$

Integration of E'_{α_0} over $(0, T_0)$ yields

$$F(u_0(\epsilon)) - F(\alpha_0) = -2\epsilon^2 \int_0^{T_0} \frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} (u'_\epsilon(\theta))^2 d\theta.$$

Define

$$J(\epsilon) = -2\epsilon^2 \int_0^{T_0} \frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} (u'_\epsilon(\theta))^2 d\theta.$$

and write

$$J(\epsilon) = J_1(\epsilon) + J_2(\epsilon)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_1(\epsilon) &= -2\epsilon^2 \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{4}} \frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} (u'_\epsilon(\theta))^2 d\theta, \\ J_2(\epsilon) &= -2\epsilon^2 \int_{\frac{\pi}{4}}^{T_0} \frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} (u'_\epsilon(\theta))^2 d\theta. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

The expression for $F(u_0(\epsilon))$ then becomes

$$F(u_0(\epsilon)) = F(\alpha_0) + J_1(\epsilon) + J_2(\epsilon). \tag{25}$$

The following lemmas are used to estimate the terms on the right hand side of (25).

Lemma (A). There exist positive constants A and ϵ_0 such that

$$|J_1(\epsilon)| < A\epsilon^{-2}e^{-\frac{2\beta}{\epsilon}} \quad \text{for } \epsilon < \epsilon_0.$$

Proof. Integration of equation (22) over $(0, \theta)$ yields

$$\epsilon^2 u'_\epsilon(\theta) = -2 \int_0^\theta \frac{\cos(2s)}{\sin(2s)} u'_\epsilon(s) ds - \int_0^\theta u_\epsilon(s)^5 - u_\epsilon(s) ds.$$

Since $u > 0$ on $(0, \pi/4)$ we have

$$\epsilon^2 u'_\epsilon(\theta) < -2 \int_0^\theta \frac{\cos(2s)}{\sin(2s)} u'_\epsilon(s) ds + \int_0^\theta u_\epsilon(s) ds$$

If $\theta < \frac{\pi}{4}$, then $\frac{\cos(2s)}{\sin(2s)} > 0$ and u_ϵ is increasing on $(0, \pi/4)$. Consequently

$$u'_\epsilon(\theta) < \epsilon^{-2} u_\epsilon(\pi/4) \theta$$

and

$$u'_\epsilon(\theta)^2 < \epsilon^{-4} u_\epsilon(\pi/4)^2 \theta^2 < \epsilon^{-4} e^{-2\beta/\epsilon} \theta^2.$$

Finally

$$\begin{aligned} |J_1(\epsilon)| &= 2\epsilon^2 \int_{\frac{\pi}{4}}^{T_0} \frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} (u'_\epsilon(\theta))^2 d\theta. \\ &< 2\epsilon^{-2} e^{-2\beta/\epsilon} \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{4}} \frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} \theta^2 d\theta. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Let $A := 2 \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{4}} \frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} \theta^2 d\theta > 0$. Then we have $|J_1(\epsilon)| < A\epsilon^{-2}e^{-2\beta/\epsilon}$.

□

Lemma (B). There exist constants B and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$J_2(\epsilon) \geq B\epsilon \quad \text{for } \epsilon < \epsilon_0.$$

Proof. We shall see that

$$B := \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon} J_2(\epsilon) > 0.$$

Write $\theta = T_0 + \epsilon s$ and let $z_\epsilon(s) = u_\epsilon(\theta)$. Then z_ϵ solves problem (18). Replacing u_ϵ by z_ϵ in (24), we have

$$J_2(\epsilon) = -2\epsilon \int_{(\frac{\pi}{4}-T_0)/\epsilon}^0 \frac{\cos(2T_0 + 2s\epsilon)}{\sin(2T_0 + 2s\epsilon)} (z'_\epsilon(s))^2 ds.$$

Let Z be the solution of problem (14)-(16). It follows from Lemma 3.3 that for any $L > 0$:

$$\int_{-L}^0 \frac{\cos(2T_0 + 2s\epsilon)}{\sin(2T_0 + 2s\epsilon)} (z'_\epsilon(s))^2 ds \rightarrow \frac{\cos(2T_0)}{\sin(2T_0)} \int_{-L}^0 (Z'(s))^2 ds$$

when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Note that if $\frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{T_0}{\epsilon} < -L < 0$ then we have that

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon} J_2(\epsilon) \geq -2 \int_{-L}^0 \frac{\cos(2T_0 + 2s\epsilon)}{\sin(2T_0 + 2s\epsilon)} (z'(s))^2 ds,$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} B := \liminf_{\epsilon} \frac{1}{\epsilon} J_2(\epsilon) &\geq -2 \liminf \int_{-L}^0 \frac{\cos(2T_0 + 2s\epsilon)}{\sin(2T_0 + 2s\epsilon)} (z'(s))^2 ds \\ &= -2 \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{-L}^0 \frac{\cos(2T_0 + 2s\epsilon)}{\sin(2T_0 + 2s\epsilon)} (z'(s))^2 ds \quad (27) \\ &= -2 \frac{\cos(2T_0)}{\sin(2T_0)} \int_{-L}^0 (Z'(s))^2 ds > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

For the estimation of $F(\alpha_0)$, we need an auxiliary Lemma. Let ϵ_1 be the constant given in Lemma (3.1) and $\kappa > 0$ be a constant such that

$$s^5 - s + \kappa s < 0 \quad \text{for } 0 < s < 1/2. \quad (28)$$

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose $\epsilon < \epsilon_1$ and $u_{\alpha,\epsilon}$ is a solution of problem (22) which is strictly increasing or decreasing on an interval $(t_1 - \delta, t_1 + \delta)$ and $u_{\alpha,\epsilon}(t_1 \pm \delta) < 1/2$. Then there exists a constant $\beta > 0$ such that*

$$u_{\alpha,\epsilon}(t_1) \leq e^{-\frac{\beta}{\epsilon}}.$$

Proof. Suppose that $u_{\alpha,\epsilon}$ is strictly increasing on $(t_1 - \delta, t_1 + \delta)$ and choose K such that $\frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} + K < 0$ for $\theta \in (t_1 - \delta, t_1 + \delta)$. Let φ_ϵ the solution of problem (13) centered in t_1 .

Let $v = \varphi_\epsilon - u_{\alpha,\epsilon}$. Thus the function v satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^2 v'' - 2\epsilon^2 K v' - \kappa v &= -\epsilon^2 u_{\alpha,\epsilon}'' + 2\epsilon^2 K u_{\alpha,\epsilon}' + \kappa u_{\alpha,\epsilon} \\ &= 2\epsilon^2 \left(\frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} + K \right) u_{\alpha,\epsilon}' + u_{\alpha,\epsilon}^5 - u_{\alpha,\epsilon} + \kappa u_{\alpha,\epsilon} \quad (29) \\ &< 2\epsilon^2 \left(\frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} + K \right) u_{\alpha,\epsilon}' \\ &< 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $\theta \in (t_1 - \delta, t_1 + \delta)$ because $u_{\alpha,\epsilon}' > 0$. Moreover $v(t_1 \pm \delta) > 0$. Then it follows from the Minimum Principle that $v(\theta) > 0$ for all θ in the interval, and in particular for $\theta = t_1$. It follows from Lemma 3.1 that

$$u_{\alpha,\epsilon}(t_1) < \varphi_\epsilon(\pi/4) < e^{-\beta/\epsilon}.$$

□

By Lemma 3.3 we know that $Z(0) = 3^{1/4}$. Then we can choose $s_0 < 0$ such that $Z(s_0) = \frac{1}{4}$ and hence $z_\epsilon(s_0) = u_\epsilon(T_0 + \epsilon s_0) \rightarrow \frac{1}{4}$ when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. It follows that for ϵ small enough,

$$u_\epsilon(T_0 + \epsilon s_0) < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Let $t_0 = T_0 + \epsilon s_0$, with ϵ so that $\frac{\pi}{4} < t_0 < T_0$. Since u is increasing on $(0, T_0)$, it yields

$$u_\epsilon(\theta) < \frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{if } 0 < \theta < t_0. \quad (30)$$

Then there exists an interval $(\pi/4 - \delta, \pi/4 + \delta)$ where the solution u_ϵ of problem (22) is strictly increasing and $u_\epsilon(\pi/4 \pm \delta) < 1/2$. It follows from Lemma 4.2 that

$$u_\epsilon(\pi/4) \leq e^{-\frac{\beta}{\epsilon}} \quad (31)$$

for all $\epsilon < \epsilon_1$.

Lemma (C). For ϵ small enough, there exists a positive constant C such that

$$|F(\alpha_0(\epsilon))| \leq C e^{-\frac{2\beta}{\epsilon}}.$$

Proof. Since u_ϵ is increasing on $(0, \pi/4)$ it follows from (31) that

$$\alpha(\epsilon) < u_\epsilon(\pi/4) \leq e^{-\beta \frac{\beta}{\epsilon}} \quad \text{for } \epsilon < \epsilon_1,$$

and since $|F|$ is increasing on $(0, 1)$ it results that for ϵ small enough

$$|F(\alpha(\epsilon))| < |F(e^{-\frac{\beta}{\epsilon}})| \leq \frac{\kappa}{2} e^{-\frac{2\beta}{\epsilon}}.$$

□

From Lemmas (A), (B) and (C) it follows that

$$F(u_0(\epsilon)) = F(\alpha_0) + J_1(\epsilon) + J_2(\epsilon),$$

with

$$|J_1(\epsilon)| < A\epsilon^{-2}e^{-2\beta/\epsilon}, \quad J_2(\epsilon) \geq B\epsilon, \quad |F(\alpha_0(\epsilon))| \leq C e^{-2\beta/\epsilon}$$

for ϵ small enough. From there follows Lemma 4.1.

□

Fixed $T_0 \in (\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{2})$, we consider the solution u_ϵ of problem (22) that reaches its first maximum at $\theta = T_0$ and we have proved that for ϵ is small enough $u_\epsilon(T_0) > \sigma$. Next we show that the solution hits the θ -axis a little after T_0 .

Lemma 4.3. *There exists a constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ there exists $\tau_\epsilon < \frac{\pi}{2}$ with the following properties:*

$$u_\epsilon(\tau_\epsilon) = 0$$




Figure 3: A 1-spike solution u of problem (7) with $u_\epsilon(\tau_1) > \sigma$.

and

$$\begin{cases} u'_\epsilon(\theta) > 0 & \text{for } 0 < \theta < T_0 \\ u'_\epsilon(\theta) < 0 & \text{for } T_0 < \theta < \tau_\epsilon. \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

Moreover

$$|T_0 - \tau_\epsilon| = O(\sqrt{\epsilon}) \quad \text{when } \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (33)$$

Proof. Recall that u_ϵ has the following properties at T_0 :

$$u_\epsilon(T_0) > \sigma \quad \text{and} \quad u'_\epsilon(T_0) = 0.$$

From equation (22) it is easy to see that there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$u''_\epsilon(\theta) < -\frac{C}{\epsilon^2} \quad (34)$$

for all $\theta > T_0$ while $u_\epsilon(\theta) > \sigma$. Integration of (34) over (T_0, θ) yields

$$u'_\epsilon(\theta) < -\frac{C}{\epsilon^2}(\theta - T_0).$$

Then

$$u_\epsilon(\theta) - u_\epsilon(T_0) < -\frac{C}{2\epsilon^2}(\theta - T_0)^2. \quad (35)$$

Since $u_\epsilon(T_0) > \sigma$ and u is decreasing while $\theta > T_0$ and $u_\epsilon(\theta) > 1$, there exists $\tau_\sigma > T_0$ such that

$$u_\epsilon(\tau_\sigma) = \sigma \quad \text{and} \quad u'_\epsilon(\tau_\sigma) < 0.$$

Taking $\theta = \tau_\sigma$ in (35) it follows that

$$\sigma - u_\epsilon(T_0) < -\frac{C}{2\epsilon^2}(\tau_\sigma - T_0)^2.$$

Note that $|u_\epsilon(T_0)| < M$ for all ϵ small and for some $M > 0$. Finally we have

$$|\tau_\sigma - T_0| = O(\epsilon). \quad (36)$$

Next we use the energy function associated with u_ϵ defined in (12). If $\theta \in (\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{2})$, then E'_ϵ satisfies

$$E'_\epsilon(\theta) = -2 \frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} (u'_\epsilon(\theta))^2 > 0.$$

Consequently integration of $E'_\epsilon(\theta)$ over (T_0, τ_σ) yields

$$0 < \frac{u'_\epsilon(\tau_\sigma)^2}{2} - \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} F(u_0(\epsilon)).$$

Therefore from Lemma 4.1 it follows:

$$u'_\epsilon(\tau_\sigma)^2 > \frac{2}{\epsilon^2} F(u_0(\epsilon)) > \frac{A}{\epsilon} \quad (37)$$

Define

$$\tau_\epsilon = \sup\{T_0 < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2} : u_\epsilon > 0 \text{ and } u'_\epsilon < 0 \text{ on } (T_0, \theta)\}.$$

and integrate E'_ϵ over (τ_σ, θ) with $\tau_\sigma < \theta < \tau_\epsilon$. Then

$$\frac{(u'_\epsilon(\theta))^2}{2} + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} F(u_\epsilon(\theta)) > \frac{(u'_\epsilon(\tau_\sigma))^2}{2}. \quad (38)$$

Since $F(u_\epsilon(\theta)) < 0$ and $u'_\epsilon(\tau_\sigma) < 0$, it follows from (37) and (38) that

$$u'_\epsilon(\theta) < u'_\epsilon(\tau_\sigma) < -\frac{\sqrt{A}}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \quad \text{for } \tau_\sigma < \theta < \tau_\epsilon,$$

Now we have:

$$|\tau_\epsilon - \tau_\sigma| < C\epsilon^{1/2}. \quad (39)$$

Write

$$|\tau_\epsilon - T_0| = |\tau_\epsilon - \tau_\sigma| + |\tau_\sigma - T_0|. \quad (40)$$

Putting the inequalities (36)-(39) into (40) we obtain the estimate (33). $\square$

This result allows us to establish the following

Proposition 4.4. *For ϵ small enough there exists $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{A}(\epsilon)$ such that the solution $u_{\alpha_0, \epsilon}$ of problem (22) with initial value $\alpha_0(\epsilon)$ has exactly one spike.*

Let $\mathcal{A}_1(\epsilon)$ the set of all connected components of $\mathcal{A}(\epsilon)$ which contains the value α_0 given in the Proposition 4.4. Note that for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1(\epsilon)$, the solution $u_{\alpha, \epsilon}(\theta)$ has exactly one spike and there is $\Theta(\alpha, \epsilon)$ such that $u_{\alpha, \epsilon}(\Theta(\alpha, \epsilon)) = 0$ by definition of $\mathcal{A}(\epsilon)$. The proof of Theorem 1.3 results from the following Propositions.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $(\alpha_1^-, \alpha_1^+) \subset (0, 1)$ be any connected component of $\mathcal{A}_1(\epsilon)$ and let $\Theta(\alpha, \epsilon)$ be as in (23). Then*

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \alpha_1^\pm} \Theta(\alpha, \epsilon) = \frac{\pi}{2}.$$

Proof. Suppose that the assertion of Proposition 4.5 is not true, and that there exists a sequence $\{\alpha_n\}$ which converges to, say α_1^- , such that $\Theta(\alpha_n, \epsilon)$ converges to a point $\theta_\infty < \frac{\pi}{2}$.

Then, by continuity $\Theta(\alpha_1^-) = \theta_\infty$ and therefore $\alpha_1^- \in \mathcal{A}(\epsilon)$, which contradicts the definition of α_1^- . □

This Proposition enables us to define:

$$\Theta_{min, \epsilon}^1 = \min\{\Theta(\alpha, \epsilon) : \alpha \in (\alpha_1^-, \alpha_1^+)\}.$$

Proposition 4.6.

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \Theta_{min, \epsilon}^1 = \frac{\pi}{4}. \quad (41)$$

Proof. In the proof of Proposition 4.4 we introduced an arbitrary point $T_0 > \frac{\pi}{4}$. We may choose this point arbitrarily close to $\frac{\pi}{4}$. In Lemma 4.3 it has been shown that by choosing ϵ small enough, we can achieve that τ_ϵ is arbitrary close to T_0 . Then we have (41). □

Let $\Gamma_1(\epsilon) = \{(\alpha, \Theta(\alpha, \epsilon)) : \alpha \in (\alpha_1^-, \alpha_1^+)\}$. It follows from Proposition 4.6 that, given $\theta_1 \in (\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{2})$, there exists $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that if $\epsilon < \epsilon_1$,

$$\frac{\pi}{4} < \Theta_{min, \epsilon}^1 < \theta_1.$$

Hence $\Gamma_1(\epsilon)$ intersects the line $\theta = \theta_1$ at least twice for all $\epsilon < \epsilon_1$. This yields at least two $\alpha_1(\epsilon), \alpha_2(\epsilon) \in \mathcal{A}_1(\epsilon)$ such that $u_{\alpha_1(\epsilon)}, u_{\alpha_2(\epsilon)}$ are solutions of problem (22) having exactly one spike, and this completes the proof of Theorem 1.3 for the case $k = 1$. In others words, we have proved that for ϵ small enough there are at least two solutions with a single spike.

Now we prove Theorem 1.3 for $k = 2$ in a similar way. We shall prove that given any $\theta_1 > \pi/4$ there exists $\epsilon_2 > 0$ such that if $\epsilon < \epsilon_2$, then problem (22) has at least two solutions with initial value on $(0, 1)$ that have exactly two spikes.

Repeating the argument we fix $T_0 \in (\frac{\pi}{4}, \theta_1)$, for ϵ small enough and find an initial value $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\tau_3(\alpha_0) = T_0.$$

Write $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(\epsilon)$; $u_\epsilon(\theta) = u_{\alpha_0(\epsilon)}(\theta)$; $u_0(\epsilon) = u_\epsilon(T_0)$ and $\tau_k(\alpha_0(\epsilon)) = \tau_k(\epsilon)$. The solution u_ϵ has one local maximum on the interval $(0, T_0)$ and another one in T_0 . In other words, for ϵ small enough,

$$\tau_1(\epsilon) < \tau_2(\epsilon) < \tau_3(\epsilon) = T_0. \quad (42)$$

Then we have the following results:




Figure 4: 2-spike solution u of problem (7) with $u_0(\epsilon) \geq \sigma$

Lemma 4.7.

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \tau_1(\epsilon) \leq \frac{\pi}{4}. \quad (43)$$

Proof. Let $\tau_+ = \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \tau_1(\epsilon)$. Note that $\tau_+ \leq T_0$ and suppose that $\frac{\pi}{4} < \tau_+ \leq T_0$. Then, repeating the previous argument with T_0 replaced by τ_+ , we find that for ϵ small enough, the solution u_ϵ has a zero τ_ϵ in a right neighbourhood of τ_+ and is strictly decreasing on (τ_+, τ_ϵ) . Since, by construction, u_ϵ has a local maximum at T_0 for every $\epsilon > 0$, which lies above the line $u = 1$, this is not possible. This completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 4.8.

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{T_0 - \tau_2(\epsilon)}{\epsilon} = \infty.$$

Proof. Note that u_ϵ is a positive solution of the equation

$$u_\epsilon''(\theta) + 2 \frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} u_\epsilon'(\theta) = \frac{u_\epsilon(\theta) - u_\epsilon(\theta)^5}{\epsilon^2} \quad (44)$$

such that

$$u_\epsilon(\tau_2(\epsilon)) = e^{-\tilde{\beta}/\epsilon} \quad u_\epsilon'(\tau_2(\epsilon)) = 0 \quad u_\epsilon(T_0) = u_0(\epsilon) \quad u_\epsilon'(T_0) = 0$$

We want to show that $u_\epsilon(\tau_2(\epsilon) + \sqrt{\epsilon}) < 1$, because u_ϵ is increasing in the interval $(\tau_2(\epsilon), T_0)$ and $u_\epsilon(\tau_2(\epsilon)) < 1 < u_\epsilon(T_0)$. This means that u_ϵ cannot catch up $u_0(\epsilon)$ in the interval $(\tau_2(\epsilon), \tau_2(\epsilon) + \sqrt{\epsilon})$. Then

$$\frac{T_0 - \tau_2(\epsilon)}{\epsilon} > \frac{\sqrt{\epsilon}}{\epsilon} \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{when } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

To see that, consider the linear auxiliary problem:

$$w''(\theta) + 2 \frac{\cos(2T_0)}{\sin(2T_0)} w'(\theta) = \frac{w(\theta)}{\epsilon^2} \quad (45)$$

with initial conditions

$$w(\tau_2(\epsilon)) = e^{-\tilde{\beta}/\epsilon} \quad w'(\tau_2(\epsilon)) = 0.$$

Then by the Sturm Comparison Theory for all $0 < \theta < T_0$, we have $u_\epsilon(\theta) < w(\theta)$. In particular,

$$u_\epsilon(\tau_2(\epsilon) + \sqrt{\epsilon}) < w(\tau_2(\epsilon) + \sqrt{\epsilon}).$$

Note that $w(\theta) = Ae^{c_1(\theta - \tau_2(\epsilon))} + Be^{c_2(\theta - \tau_2(\epsilon))}$, where c_1, c_2 are the roots of the equation $\epsilon^2 x^2 - 2\epsilon^2 Kx - 1 = 0$, with $K = -\frac{\cos(2T_0)}{\sin(2T_0)}$. Let $\mu_\epsilon = K^2 + \kappa/\epsilon^2$. Then A, B are given by

$$A = \frac{K - \sqrt{\epsilon}}{2\sqrt{\mu_\epsilon}} e^{-\tilde{\beta}/\epsilon}, \quad B = \frac{K + \sqrt{\epsilon}}{2\sqrt{\mu_\epsilon}} e^{-\tilde{\beta}/\epsilon}.$$

Finally we have

$$w(\tau_2(\epsilon) + \sqrt{\epsilon}) = \epsilon^{-\tilde{\beta}/\epsilon} + (K - \sqrt{\mu_\epsilon})\sqrt{\epsilon} + \frac{K - \sqrt{\epsilon}}{2\sqrt{\mu_\epsilon}} e^{-\tilde{\beta}/\epsilon + 2\sqrt{\mu_\epsilon}\sqrt{\epsilon}}.$$

Consequently, for ϵ small enough $w(\tau_2(\epsilon) + \sqrt{\epsilon}) < 1$. □

Lemma 4.9. *Let u_ϵ be a 2-spike solution of (22) with $\tau_2(\epsilon)$ the second critical point. Then there are constants $\beta > 0$ and $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that*

$$u_\epsilon(\tau_2(\epsilon)) \leq e^{-\frac{\beta}{\epsilon}} \text{ for } \epsilon < \epsilon_1.$$

Proof. From (42) and (43) follows that for fixed $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta = \delta(\epsilon) > 0$ such that

$$\text{either} \quad |\tau_2(\epsilon) - T_0| > 2\delta \quad (46)$$

$$\text{or} \quad |\tau_2(\epsilon) - \pi/4| > 2\delta. \quad (47)$$

Suppose (46) and let t_1 be such that

$$(t_1 - \delta, t_1 + \delta) \subset (\tau_2(\epsilon), T_0) \quad \text{and} \quad u_\epsilon(t_1 \pm \delta) < 1/2.$$

Then u is increasing on $(t_1 - \delta, t_1 + \delta)$ and it follows from Lemma 4.2 that

$$u_\epsilon(\tau_2(\epsilon)) < u_\epsilon(t_1) < e^{-\beta/\epsilon},$$

where β does not depend on ϵ . The case in which δ satisfies (47) is analogous. □

Integration of $E'_\epsilon(\theta)$ over $(\tau_2(\epsilon), T_0)$ yields

$$F(u_0(\epsilon)) - F(u_\epsilon(\tau_2(\epsilon))) = J(\epsilon)$$

where

$$J(\epsilon) = -2\epsilon^2 \int_{\tau_2(\epsilon)}^{T_0} \frac{\cos(2\theta)}{\sin(2\theta)} (u'_\epsilon)^2 d\theta.$$

Then

$$F(u_0(\epsilon)) = F(u_\epsilon(\tau_2(\epsilon))) + J(\epsilon). \quad (48)$$

Next we show that there is a constant $A > 0$ such that $F(u_0(\epsilon)) > A\epsilon$ for ϵ enough small.

Lemma ($\tilde{A}$). There is a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$J(\epsilon) > C_1\epsilon$$

for ϵ small enough.

Proof. To prove this lemma we may assume that $\tau_2(\epsilon) > \pi/4$, because when $\tau_2(\epsilon) < \pi/4$, the proof operates in the same way as before. Write $\theta = T_0 + \epsilon s$ and $z_\epsilon(s) = u_\epsilon(\theta)$ and replace u by z in J . Then, $z = z_\epsilon$ solves problem (18) and

$$J(\epsilon) = -2\epsilon \int_{\frac{\tau_2(\epsilon) - T_0}{\epsilon}}^0 \frac{\cos(2T_0 + 2s\epsilon)}{\sin(2T_0 + 2s\epsilon)} (z'(s))^2 ds$$

It follows from Lemma 3.3 that for any $0 < L < (T_0 - \pi/4)/\epsilon$

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 := \liminf_{\epsilon} \frac{1}{\epsilon} J(\epsilon) &\geq -2 \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{-L}^0 \frac{\cos(2T_0 + 2s\epsilon)}{\sin(2T_0 + 2s\epsilon)} (z'(s))^2 ds \\ &= -2 \frac{\cos(2T_0)}{\sin(2T_0)} \int_{-L}^0 (Z'(s))^2 ds > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Since for $s \in (-(T_0 - \pi/4)/\epsilon, 0)$

$$\frac{\cos(2T_0 + 2\epsilon s)}{\sin(2T_0 + 2\epsilon s)} < 0.$$

□

The following lemma will be needed in order to complete the proof and follows immediately from Lemma 4.9.

Lemma ($\tilde{B}$). There is a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that

$$|F(u_\epsilon(\tau_2(\epsilon)))| < C_2 e^{-\beta/2\epsilon}$$

for ϵ small enough.

From Lemmas ($\tilde{A}$), ($\tilde{B}$) and the equation (48) we can see that $F(u_0(\epsilon)) > 0$ for ϵ enough small. Then it follows that $u_0(\epsilon) \geq \sigma$ and therefore u_ϵ is strictly decreasing for $\theta > T_0$ whenever $u_\epsilon(\theta) > 0$. This implies that u_ϵ has a zero $\Theta_\epsilon \in (T_0, \frac{\pi}{2})$ and allows us to establish the following

Proposition 4.10. *For ϵ small enough there exists $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{A}(\epsilon)$ such that the solution $u_{\alpha_0}(\theta)$ of problem (22) with initial value α_0 has exactly two spike.*

We define the set $\mathcal{A}(\epsilon)$ as before and let $\mathcal{A}_2(\epsilon)$ be the set of all connected components of $\mathcal{A}(\epsilon)$ which contains the value α_0 defined in (4.10).

Then for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_2$, the solution $u_{\alpha,\epsilon}(\theta)$ has exactly two spikes and there is $\Theta(\alpha, \epsilon)$ such that $u_{\alpha,\epsilon}(\Theta(\alpha, \epsilon)) = 0$ by definition of $\mathcal{A}$.

The proof of Theorem 1.3 for $k = 2$ results from the following Propositions.

Proposition 4.11. *Let $(\alpha_2^-, \alpha_2^+) \subset (0, 1)$ be any connected component of $\mathcal{A}_2(\epsilon)$ and $\Theta(\alpha, \epsilon)$ as in (23). Then*

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \alpha_2^\pm} \Theta(\alpha, \epsilon) = \frac{\pi}{2}.$$

Now we can define:

$$\Theta_{min,\epsilon}^2 = \min\{\Theta(\alpha, \epsilon) : \alpha \in (\alpha_2^-, \alpha_2^+)\}.$$

Proposition 4.12.

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \Theta_{min,\epsilon}^2 = \frac{\pi}{4}. \quad (50)$$

Let $\Gamma_2(\epsilon) = \{(\alpha, \Theta(\alpha, \epsilon)) : \alpha \in (\alpha_2^-, \alpha_2^+)\}$. It follows from Proposition 4.12 that, given $\theta_1 \in (\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{2})$, there exists $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that if $\epsilon < \epsilon_1$, then

$$\frac{\pi}{4} < \Theta_{min,\epsilon}^2 < \theta_1.$$

Hence $\Gamma_2(\epsilon)$ intersects the line $\theta = \theta_1$ at least twice. This yields at least two $\alpha_1(\epsilon), \alpha_2(\epsilon) \in \mathcal{A}_2(\epsilon)$ such that $u_{\alpha_1(\epsilon)}, u_{\alpha_2(\epsilon)}$ are solutions of problem (22) having exactly two spikes, and thus completes the proof of Theorem 1.3 for $k = 2$.

Finally, we turn to solutions with k spikes. They are located at the points $\{\tau_{2j-1} : j = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$. In the construction we fix $\tau_{2k-1} = T_0$ and we show that $\limsup \tau_{2(k-1)-1} \leq \pi/2$. This can be done with the methods developed in this section. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Acknowledgments. The author thanks Professors P. Amster and J. Petean for valuable observations and suggestions.

References

- [1] J. Petean, *The Yamabe invariant of simply connected manifolds* **523** (2000), 225-231.
- [2] C. BANDLE AND R. BENGURIA, *The Brezis-Nirenberg problem on $\mathbb{S}^3$* , *J. Diff. Equ.* **178** (2002) 264-279.

- [3] C. BANDLE AND L.A. PELETIER, *Best constants and Emden equations for the critical exponent in $\mathbb{S}^3$* , *Math. Ann.* **313** (1999) 83-93.
- [4] H. BREZIS AND L. NIRENBERG, *Positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponents*, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **36** (1983), 437-477.
- [5] H. BREZIS AND L. A. PELETIER, *Elliptic equations with critical exponent on spherical caps of $\mathbb{S}^3$* , *J. Anal. Math.* **98** (2006), 279-316.
- [6] B. GIDAS, W.M. NI AND L. NIRENBERG, *Symmetry and related properties via the maximum principle*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **68** (1979) 20-243.
- [7] M.K. KWONG AND Y. LI, *Uniqueness of radial solutions of semilinear elliptic equations*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **333** (1992), 339-363.
- [8] J. PETEAN, *Metrics of constant scalar curvature conformal to Riemannian products*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **138** (2010), 2897-2905.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, FCEYN, UNIVERSIDAD DE BUENOS AIRES, CIUDAD UNIVERSITARIA, PABELLÓN I (C1428EHA) BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA.

E-mail address: carey@dm.uba.ar